62-40-1163.95

# Serial Scope:

EBF 1109x

Released under the John F. Kennedy Rasassination Records Dollection Act of 1992 (44 TBC 2127 Dote). Dase=:DW 88286 Date: Vol. 14



### The United States Senate

Report of Proceedings

#### Hearing held before

Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations
With Respect to Intelligence Activities

INTELAIGENCE INVESTIGATION

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED

HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

ALM DATE LO TO BY SPACE ALM DATE

MDR-16

Wednesday, November 19, 1975

Washington, D. C.

WARD & PAUL

410 FIRST STREET, S. E. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20008

(202) 544-6000

#### $\underline{\mathtt{C}} \ \underline{\mathtt{O}} \ \underline{\mathtt{N}} \ \underline{\mathtt{T}} \ \underline{\mathtt{E}} \ \underline{\mathtt{N}} \ \underline{\mathtt{T}}$

STATEMENT OF:	PAGE
Testimony of James B. Adams, Deputy Associate Director FBI Intelligence Division	1738
rbr interrigence bryrbron	1750

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNICLASSIFIED
DATE 10/25/07 BYSPZALMOLY
MOR-16

KELLYGSH

#### INTELLIGENCE INVESTIGATION

Wednesday, November 19, 1975

Operations with Respect to

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
HOR IS

Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 o'clock a.m., in Room 318, Russell Senate Office Building, the Honorable Frank Church (Chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Church (presiding), Hart (Michigan),
Mondale, Huddleston, Hart (Colo) Baker, Tower, Gold, Mathias and Schweiker.

Also present: Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr., Chief Counsel and Curtis R. Smothers, Minority Counsel.

The Chairman. The hearing will please come to order.

Our witnesses today are Mr. James B. Adams, the Deputy

Associate Director of the FBI, and Mr. Raymond Wannall, who

is the Assistant Director in charge of the Intelligence

Division of the FBI.

Before I swear the witnesses, Senator Mondale has asked if he might make an opening statement. And for that purpose the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

l

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Mondale. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have always supported the FBI. It is clearly the finest, most professional law enforcement agency in the nation and probably in the world. In apprehending robbers, foiling kidnappers, catching fugitives, the FBI has an outstanding record.

This is based on my own experience with the FBI in my own state where I served as Attorney General. The vast bulk of its work is devoted to law enforcement and legitimate counter-espionage.

In these fields the FBI deserves fully the admiration and respect which Americans traditionally held for the Bureau and its personnel. But in one area, domestic intelligence, the FBI, in my opinion, has clearly gone astray. appears that there was an underworld within the FBI which took the tools, techniques and zeal which was so effective against the real foreign threats and turned them in upon some of the American people.

Yesterday this Committee heard some of the most disturbing testimony that can be imagined in a free society. We heard evidence that for decades the institutions designed to enforce the laws and constitutions of our country itself has been engaging in conduct that violates the law and the Constitution. We heard that the FBI, which is a part of the Department of Justice, took justice into its own hands by seeking to punish

those with unpopular ideas. We learned that the chief law enforcement agency in the Federal government decided that it did not need laws to investigate and suppress the peaceful and constitutional activities of those whom it disapproved. We heard testimony that the FBI, to protect the country against those it believed had totalitarian political views, employed the tactics of totalitarian societies against American citizens. We heard that the FBI attempted to destroy one of our greatest leaders in the field of civil rights, and then replace him with someone of the FBI's choosing.

From the evidence the Committee has obtained it is clear that the FBI for decades has conducted surveillance over the personal and political activities of millions of Americans. Evidently, no meeting was too small, no group too insignificant to escape their attention. It did not seem to matter whether the politics of these Americans were legal or radical or whether the participants were well known It did not matter whether the information was intimate and personal. The FBI created indexes, more commonly called enemy lists, of thousands of Americans and targeted many of the Americans on these lists for special Hundreds of thousands of Americans were victims of this surveillance program. Most of this was done in secret. Much of it was kept from Congress and the Justice Department and all of it from the American people. No one outside the

3

2

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

FBI has ever had an opportunity to know and appreciate the full extent of the domestic surveillance program that was then being conducted. The

Thus we see that just as in the case of the CIA the key issue was accountability: How we can assure that the secret instruments of government are accountable to the people, the Congress and the law.

It is clear that the FBI's authority for these programs is essentially non-existent. I am not persuaded that the secret Presidential orders of President Roosevelt support the Domestic Intelligence program, and even if it did, I do not believe that any President has the authority to order the FBI or anyone else to spy on Americans, to burgle their homes, to wiretap them, to open their mail or to blackmail them.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this affair is that the FBI never paid very much attention to whether their activities were authorized or not or whether they were legal and constitutional. One former senior intelligence officer has testified that he never once heard a discussion about legality or constitutionality. Most governments in history have relied on some form of police power to determine what views would prevail in their society. However, America was based on the revolutionary concept that the people should decide what is right and what is wrong, what is acceptable and what is not.

. 8

That is what we meant by a free government, and our forefathers were convinced that it can exist only through the greatest tolerance of speech and opinion. They placed their faith in the people to remain alert to encroachments on their liberty.

The founders of our country knew that the greatest danger to freedom comes from the efforts of government to suppress the opinions of its opponents. They set up a system which limited the powers of government, bound it in the constraints of the law, and prohibited it from infringing on the rights of people to free expression. And through the separation of power, the system of checks and balances, they tried to assure that the Executive would be accountable to the people through the Congress.

For the 200 years of our existence as a nation the preservation of liberty has been a constant struggle. Whether it has been the Alien and Sedition Acts during the French Revolution, the Red Scare and the Palmer Raids of World War I, or McCarthyism after World War II, or Army spying during the Vietnam War, the government has let a fear of unorthodox opinion lead it into the trap of infringing upon the Constitution in the name of internal security.

The issues we confront today are a part of a continuing drama of American democracy. It is proof, if we ever needed it, that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Revelations of abuse of power do not threaten domestic security. These hearings do not weaken the FBI. What weakens it is its failure to adhere to the proper role of law enforcement. Somehow it forgot that this was its job. Ιt began to use its energy to spy on Americans whose only offense was an expressing opinions that some in the FBI did not like. It confused talk of violence with acts of violence, and all too often paid more attention to the talk than to the "act.

The answer, of course, is that violence justifies prosecution, not surveillance. Our security is not improved by watching those who commit crimes. Security from violence lies in active and vigorous law enforcement of those who are committing crimes. Security fram dangerous ideas, if we need any security, should come not from the FBI but from the merit of better ideas, in the good sense of the American people.

Our liberty is best protected by scrupulous adherence to the law and the Constitution by the agencies of government.

No government agency likes to be the subject of public scrutiny. I know these have been difficult times for the present leadership of the FBI, many of whom were not involved in these programs at all. But if they had been spending a lot of time responding to Congressional investigations, they could not forget that this is the first time in 50 years that

- 23

the FBI had been subjected to public scrutiny.

As painful as this process is, I hope the FBI itself would welcome the opportunity to let in some fresh air and come to grips with the problems in candor and not retreat into past patterns of stirring up public fears to distract our attention from the necessity of reform.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that yesterday I am told that following our hearing the FBI responded exactly in the spirit that I had hoped it would. If they can take this constructive approach, I have no doubt that the FBI will benefit from this attention. I want to see a strong FBI, an FBI strong in law enforcement, in the detection of crime, and in the gathering of legal evidence for prosecution and conviction, but an FBI without abuses.

As we proceed with these hearings today, we should also bear in mind the responsibility for the abuses we have uncovered does not rest on the FBI alone. We in the Congress have been derelict. It should not have taken until this date for us to discharge our responsibility for investigating FBI and other domestic intelligence.

We should also realize that the FBI has been performing a function which many Americans, and at times the vast majority of Americans, have wanted to see undertaken. When popular opinion brands a group unAmerican and subversive merely because of its political views, all too often the FBI

.10

1,4

. 20

has reponded to public expectations and from pressure from a higher authority in government.

While this does not excuse what happened, we should temper our criticism of the FBI's excesses by understanding that in large part it was only the instrument of our own intolerance. Indeed, I believe that is why our laws and the charter of the FBI must be carefully redrawn to protect the FBI's integrity from political pressures and hysteria.

Finally, it would be a mistake to regard the abuses of the FBI as those of evil men. The FBI has always been composed of dedicated and hard-working public servants who seek to do their jobs as best they can. The lesson we learn from this history is that we cannot keep our liberty secure by relying alone on the good faith of men with great power.

As Mr. Justice Brandeis once wrote:

"Experience should teach us to be most on guard to protect liberty when government's purposes are beneficient. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment of men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

It is my hope that the FBI witnesses we will hear today can enlighten us as to how it can conduct internal security surveillance programs which do not infringe on our constitutional liberties. I hope they can suggest iron-clad assurances that the abuses of the past will not be repeated.

We need more protection than promises of self-restraint by men of good will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Thank you, Senator Mondale. That is an excellent statement with which I would like to be fully associated.

Senator Hart of Michigan. I would, Mr. Chairman, also, except that I want to make clear my family certainly did not support, encourage, or by its vocal position give any indication to the Bureau that they could do what they did.

I don't want to go too far in suggesting that what we heard yesterday was simply responding by the Bureau to the mood of those years.

In those years if we had known what you were doing,

I lay dough, most families would have said stop it.

Senator Mondale. That is true. I think one of the points that we might aver to is the Houston Plan and the tremendous pressure the FBI was placed under to again resume techniques that it had abandoned in 1966. There is no question that they were getting private pressure from higher authority to do things. In that instance they didn't want it.

The Chairman. Well, I was struck with the fact that
the Houston Plan, as illegal as it was, was limited to techniques
far more restrictive than the far-reaching methods that were

-8

1,4

employed by the FBI during the years that we have reviewed in yesterday's hearings. They led beyond anything that was ever contained in any official document requesting from the President additional authority.

Now I think, Mr. Adams, Mr. Wannall, in addition to swearing you both, if you are going to have occasion to ask others who are with you to testify in response to certain questions, that it would be well at this time to swear them also.

So if that is the case, anyone who anticipates that he may be testifying in this morning's hearing in response to questions, if you will all stand and take the oath at this time.

Do you and each of you solemnly swear that all of the testimony that you will give in these proceedings will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr.cAdams. IIdo::

Mr. Wannall: I do.:

to furnish me with the statutory authority that presently exists that could be said to relate to the FBI's intelligence activities, which was of course the subject of yesterday's hearings.

And I am furnished in response to that request
Title XVIII, Section 533 of the United States Code, which

2

3

5

6

7

; 8

.10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"The Attorney General may appoint officials: reads as follows: one, to detect and prosecute crimes against the United States: two, to assist in the protection of the person of the President; and three, to conduct such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as maybe directed by the Attorney General.

Now yesterday, Mr. Wannall, we were told about a series of activities that were undertaken by the FBI, and indeed, initiated within the FBI, the purpose of which was to harass and discredit Dr. Martin Luther King.

Now I am not referring to the results of any FBI investigative activity, but rather, I am referring to these kinds of initiatives that were undertaken for the purpose of either harassing or embarrassing or otherwise discrediting Mr. King himself.

My first question is was Dr. King, in his advocacy of equal rights for black citizens, advocating a course of action that in the opinion of the FBI constituted a crime?

1:5

TESTIMONY OF JAMES B. ADAMS, DEPUTY ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
OF THE FBI, AND RAYMOND WANNALL, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,

Mr. Adams. No, sir.

The Chairman. So he was not then thought to be engaged in any criminal activity. In fact, he was preaching, as I remember those days, non-violence, was he not, as a method of achieving equal rights for black citizens?

Mr. Adams. That's right, his advocacy for civil rights.

The Chairman. His advocacy of civil rights was non-violent and therefore legal in character.

Mr. Adams. That was not the basis of our investigation of him.

The Chairman. But as you have said, he was not engaging in any unlawful activity in connection with his advocacy of equal rights for black citizens.

Is that correct?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Well, is it true that at one time the FBI undertook to discourage an American college from conferring an honorary degree on Dr. King?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. On what legal basis does the FBI have a right to interfere, in an effort to discourage a college from

NW 55086 DocId: 32989543 Page 15

2

3

5

6

7

8

-10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conferring an honorary degree upon a man like Dr. Martin Luther King, who was not engaging in or suspected of engaging in criminal activity? Mr. Adams. I know of no basis.

The Chairman. Why did the FBI do it?

Mr. Adams. Well, we have to approach two parts, in my estimation, Senator Church. One, the basis for our investigation of Martin Luther King, which was to determine communist influence on him, my hands are tied in discussing that somewhat on the basis that there is certain information which today, from an ongoing operation is sensitive and which, of course, we have made known to you and certain staff members.

I would like to say on the basis that from our review we feel that we initially had a basis for investigating Martin Luther King.

Now as far as the activities which you are asking about, the discrediting, I know of no basis for that and I will not attempt to justify it.

The Chairman. You never made a finding, did you, that Martin Luther King was a communist?

Mr. Adams. No, sir, we did not. We were investigating communist influence and the possible effect on him. never made such a determination.

The Chairman. Very well. Then there was no justification

First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for the FBI to interfere?

To discredit him. Mr. Adams.

The Chairman. In conferring an honorary degree upon him.

Mr. Adams. I cannot find any justification for that.

The Chairman. Is it true that the FBI on another occasion intervened in an attempt to prevent Dr. Martin Luther King from seeing the Pope?

Mr. Adams. I believe that is correct, sir. There were approximately 25 incidents, I believe, of actions taken in this regard. I think Mr. Schwarz has those available, that I would lump basically all of them into the same situation of I see no statutory basis or no basis of justification for the activity.

The Chairman. But what was the motive, there being no statutory basis or other valid basis? What was the motive for attempting to prevent Dr. Martin Luther King from visiting with the Pope?

Mr. Adams. In looking at absolute motive, I don't think the files which we have reviewed and made available to the Committee, give me a clear picture of what the motive was. I think that there were, the motive was certainly known to Mr. Hoover. It was known to one top official who is no longer with the Bureau and maybe known to others, all of whom have been interviewed by the Committee. Matters bearing on what

\_.10

and Tape 12

110 First Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

might have been the real motive or the possible motive, I again feel, because of reasons of privacy and delicacy, are not a proper subject of discussion at a public hearing.

I think we know what could have influenced this, but one, the primary individual, Mr. Hoover, is not with us.

Individuals who were closest to him in this effort are not with us. And the Committee itself has interviewed him.

So I really am not in a position to discuss this motive issue.

The Chairman. Nevertheless, you would agree that whatever the motive, it was a very improper thing to do.

Mr. Adams. I cannot find any justification, no, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Chairman. Is it true that after Dr. Martin Luther King had been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize, that an anonymous letter was sent to Dr. Martin Luther King and to Mrs. King, Coretta King, his wife, which was sent 34 days before he was to receive the Nobel Peace Prize?

Mr. Adams. I do not think those dates are correct. The Chairman. Well, it was sent --

Mr. Adams. It was before he was to receive it. 34 days -- upon reconstruction by one of the members of my staff, 34 days would have been Christmas Day, and whether that 34 days --

The Chairman. It is hard to believe that such a letter would be written on Christmas Day.

Mr. Adams. It was not written on Christmas Day, but 34 days -- the Nobel Peace Prize I think was on December 10, the letter +3 34 days from the date of the mailing of the letter as has been reconstructed, as best as possible, would have been Christmas Day.

Was the letter written and sent by the The Chairman. FBI?

Mr. Adams. We have no information to that effect. All we know is that the draft, or original, of what may have been the letter was found in papers::of the FBI left after a former official departed the FBI. We know that based upon inquiries that we have conducted and you have conducted, we know that the

letter	was	not		I me	ean	it	was	in	connection	with	other
materia	al.	So I	I th	nink	we	can	ass	sume			

The Chairman. Other materials which were sent.

Mr. Adams. That's right. So I can assume that the letter was sent. I have determined nothing from my review of the files, and neither has your staff, to my knowledge, or has been reported back to me which would indicate that this action was duly recorded in any file or was a part of any authorized program or anything else. This is a void that I do not think any of us has been satisfactorily able to resolve.

The Chairman. We know the letter appeared in the files. know that the letter was received. We know it was associated with other matters that were sent by the FBI to Dr. Martin Luther King.

Mr. Adams. The letter was never in our files in the sense that it was entered into the official files of the FBI. It was among papers --

The Chairman. It was among papers...

Mr. Adams. Left. by an individual who had departed.

The Chairman. That individual being Mr. Sullivan?

Mr. Adams. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. The letter read, "King, there is only one thing left for you to do. You know what it is. You have just 34 days in which to do: it, this exact number has been selected for a specific reason. It has definite practical significance.

You are done. There is but one way out for you."

Now, if you had received such a letter, how would you have interpreted it? What would you have thought it meant?

Mr. Adams. I have read that statement. I have heard the conclusions of your staff that it was a suicide urging. I can't find any basis upon which they drew that conclusion. I think that, approaching it from an objective standpoint, as I read it, I don't know what it means.

I think rather than a conclusion it should be a speculation in a realm of possibilities as to what was intended, but I cannot -- I don't understand the basis for it. It is a possibility, but I certainly would not reach such a conclusion from my reading of that statement.

The Chairman. Now, if you had received a letter of this kind and it had been directed to you, if you were in Dr. King's position and you read, "King, there is only one thing left for you to do. You know what it is. You have just 34 days in which to do it." Now, that happened to correspond to the time before which he was to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. What would you think that meant?

Mr. Adams. I would have to consider what I was being accused of. I would have to consider what the facts were. I would have to consider what the intent of the person was writing such a note, coming just before Christmas. I don't know if it means, it is an urging to repent from something this person,